DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 037 724 AL 002 352

TITLE	The Language Development Project; A Pilot Study in Language Learning. A New York State Urban Aid Project. Mid-Year Report, February 1969.
INSTITUTION	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY	New York State Education Dept., Albany.
PUB DATE	Feb 69
NOTE	70p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.60
DESCRIPTORS	*Bilingual Education, Disadvantaged Youth, *English (Second Language), Inservice Teacher Education, Language Development, Linguistic Theory, Parent Participation, Primary Grades, Puerto Ricans, *Tenl, Workshops

ABSTRACT

The Language Development Project is designed to provide assistance to disadvantaged primary-grade children who are learning English as a second language or who use non-standard speech patterns. Materials and special teaching techniques used in the project were originally developed at the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (SEDL) for use with English as a second language learners in San Antonio, Texas. SEDL materials in the areas of "Self-Concept" and "Science" were purchased from the Laboratory, and the children use these special language development materials on a daily basis. In addition, they receive assistance in language development during their other instructional time. This document contains a list of schools and staff involved in the project, a schedule of workshops and visitations, an outline of the duties of the demonstration teachers, and a comprehensive evaluation of The Language Development Program's first year (1967-68). See related documents AL 002 353 and 354 for subsequent reports. (DO)

ED037724

THE LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

A Pilot Study in Language Learning

A New York State Urban Aid Project

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

MID-YEAR REPORT

February 1969

AL 002 352

Dr. Bernard E. Donovan, Superintendent of Schools

Helene M. Lloyd, Assistant Superintendent

Eugene C. Gibney, Project Director

Board of Education of the City of New York

ED037724

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
110 Livingston Street - Brooklyn, New York

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

This project is being developed in cooperation with Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, Austin, Texas. Financial support for the project is received through Urban Education Funds, New York State Department of Education.

Mid-Year Report, January, 1969

Bernard E. Donovan, Superintendent of Schools
Helene M. Lloyd, Assistant Superintendent
Eugene C. Gibney, Project Director

I. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND DESCRIPTION

1.1 The Language Development Project, initiated with approximately 800 kindergarten and first-grade pupils in 4 New York City schools in September, 1967, is designed to provide assistance to disadvantaged children who are learning English as a second language or who use non-standard speech patterns. The schools in the project last year were as follows: Manhattan - P.S. 96, P.S. 102, P.S. 180; Bronx - P.S. 5.

This year the project was expanded to 5 schools in Brooklyn, namely, P.S. 19, 17, 396, 175 and 156. It was also extended to the second grade in the Manhattan and Bronx schools in the project last year. Approximately 2700 children and 90 teachers are involved in the project during 1968-69.

1.2 Materials and special teaching techniques used in the project were originally developed at the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory for use with English as a second language learners in San Antonio, Texas, as a result of partial support by the United States Office of Education.

1.3 SEDL materials in the areas of Self-Concept and Science have been purchased from the Laboratory and are being used in the project in New York City. Designated classes in selected schools are using these materials in both English and Spanish.

1.4 Children use the special language development material in self-concept and science on a daily basis for the time designated below. These time blocks are divided to meet children's attention spans.

Kindergarten pupils . . . . . 40 minutes a day
Grades 1 and 2 . . . . . .60 minutes a day

In addition, the pupils receive assistance in language development during their other instructional time.

1.5 An orientation program was held for teachers and supervisors outside regular school hours in order to acquaint them with the methodology of the program. Communications to teachers are sent through the principal and his School Coordinator. The Coordinator is supplied with copies of the workshop agendas and materials in order that both he and the principal are informed as to the progress of the project. The Demonstration Teachers and Spanish-Speaking Teachers also work closely with the administrator of the school. Principals, coordinators and district superintendents are invited to all workshop sessions. Several of the principals in the project visited schools in the Texas project during 1967-68; three principals visited during January, 1969.

1.6 Schools in Project

Total - 9 schools - 90 classes (K - 2)

Borough	School	Classes	Grade	Demonstration Teacher	Spanish-Speaking Teacher
Brooklyn					
(5 schools 36 classes)	P.S. 156	5 Cl.	Gr. 1	Eleanor Mackelduff(2days)	
	P.S. 175	5 Cl.	Gr. 1	Eleanor Mackelduff(2days)	
	P.S. 396	5 Cl.	Gr. 1	Priscilla Perlman(5 days)	
	P.S. 17	5 Cl.	Gr. 1	Eleanor Mackelduff(1day)	Filomena Fonte
	P.S. 19	16 Cl.	Gr. 1	Helen Spevack(5 days)	Ada DiScipio Arthur Nieves
Manhattan					
(3 schools 37 classes)	P.S. 96	3 Cl.	Kgn.	Ruth Calderon (3 days)	
		5 Cl.	Gr. 1		
		6 Cl.	Gr. 2		
	P.S. 102	3 Cl.	Kgn.	Aida Mora (2 days)	Isabel Velez
		4 Cl.	Gr. 1		
		4 Cl.	Gr. 2		
	P.S. 180	6 Cl.	Gr. 1	Ruth Calderon (2 days)	
		6 Cl.	Gr. 2		
Bronx					
(1 school 17 classes)	P.S. 5	9 Cl.	Gr. 2	Aida Mora (3 days)	
		8 Cl.	Gr. 1		

2. OBJECTIVES

2.1 To promote the language development of selected children from Puerto Rico learning English as a second language and of other children having non-standard English speech patterns.

2.2 To train selected teachers and supervisors in the principles of language development and in the use of special materials as developed in the program of the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

2.3 To train teachers and supervisors in the project in the application of linguistic principles in order to promote the language development of children.

2.4 To provide guidelines for use by teachers and supervisors in New York City and New York State for meeting the language development needs of disadvantaged children.

2.5 To involve parents, community people and college staff in selected aspects of the program.

2.6 To explore and study special psychological and sociological insights that may be helpful to teachers of disadvantaged children.

3. PROJECT STAFF

3.1 Assistant Superintendent Supervising Project

3.1.1 Helene M. Lloyd, Assistant Superintendent

3.2 Project Director

3.2.1 Mr. Eugene C. Gibney

3.3 Demonstration Teachers

3.3.1 Mrs. Aida Mora (6 years teaching experience)

3.3.2 Miss Ruth Calderon (4 years teaching experience in New York City, 11 years in Puerto Rico)

3.3.3 Mrs. Helen Spevack (7 years teaching experience)

3.3.4 Miss Eleanor Mackelduff (2 years teaching experience in San Antonio, Texas, using the approaches and materials developed by SEDL)

3.3.5 Mrs. Priscilla Perlman (5 years teaching experience)

3.4 Spanish-Speaking Teachers

3.4.1 Mrs. Ada DiScipio (no experience in teaching); License - common branches - substitute Auxiliary Teacher; major in Spanish, C.C.N.Y.

3.4.2 Miss Isabel Velez (4½ years teaching experience in Puerto Rico; 1 year exchange program in New Jersey; 1 year exchange program in New York; 1 year bilingual teacher in New York); License - Bilingual Teacher; M.A. in Spanish, N.Y.U.

3.4.3 Mr. Arthur Nieves - graduated from Columbia University as a Spanish major. This is his first year of teaching. He has previously worked with Spanish children in a Citizenship Council Summer Project at Columbia; License - Sub. common branches conditional.

3.4.4 Miss Filomena Fonte - License: common branches; has studied Spanish literature at School of Arts and Sciences at N.Y.U. on graduate level; has BA from Queens College; major Latin American studies; has MA from N.Y.U. - field of Teaching Spanish on elementary school level (FLES); this is her third year of teaching.

3.5 School Staff in Project

3.5.1 Manhattan

P.S. 96

District Superintendent - Mr. Martin Frey
Principal - Mr. Charles Miras (Acting)
Coordinator - Mr. Arnold Flicker (Actg. Asst. Principal)

Teachers

Kindergarten - Anne Reed
Marya Porter

Grade 1 - Gloria Miller
Arleen Bishins
Joanne Childs
Migdalia Romero
Mabel Halpern
Yvonne Davis

Grade 2 - Rosalie Scaglione
Linda Poverman
Aileen Eustace
Carol Posner
Madeline Pannell
Carol Soslowitz

P.S. 102

District Superintendent - Mr. Martin Frey
Principal - Mrs. Bernice Peebles
Coordinator - Mrs. Shirley Selikson, Early Childhood Coordinator

Teachers

Kindergarten - Louise Vertes
Margaret Gerber
Norma Mingo

Grade 1 - Geraldine Pellettieri
Andrea Rosen
Cheryl Subkoff
Fanny Tomasulo
Carol Steinberg
Eugene Meyers

3.5 School Staff in Project (continued)

Grade 2 - Marelen Small
Dorothy Gold
Margaret Cicileo
Josephine Sorgie

P.S. 180

District Superintendent - Dr. Nathan Jacobson
Principal - Mr. Max Weinstein
Coordinator - Mrs. Gloria McKenney, Asst. Principal

Teachers

Grade 1 - Shirley Samuels
Joanne Marketos
Joan Gottfried
Miriam Golovensky
Barbara Danon
Nancy Daly

Grade 2 - Barbara Dyer
Dorothea Beach
Linda Fechter
Constance Tom
Sylvia Simon
Barbara Banks

3.5.2 Brooklyn

P.S. 19

District Superintendent - Mr. Ralph Brande
Principal - Mr. Harry Levine
Coordinator - Mrs. Anita Bergman

Teachers

Grade 1 - Diane Lippe
Rachel Rabinowitz
Gloria Wirtz
Carol Winkler
Arlene Goldhammer
Charlotte Lerer
Catherine Cirrito
Victoria Eskolosky
Mary O'Neill
Catherine Todd
Rochelle Spanier
Toby Schom
Harriet Bernstein
Deena Roth
Marsha Samberg
Geraldine Gaudiosi

School Staff in Project (continued)

P.S. 156

District Superintendent - Mr. Saul Siegal
Principal - Mr. Robert Gofter
Coordinator - Mrs. Gladys Galamison

Teachers

Grade 1 - Thelma Zellman
Phyllis Holmes
Hilda DuBois
Lynne Ransom

P.S. 175

District Superintendent - Mr. Saul Siegal
Principal - Mr. Abraham Bompey
Coordinator - Miss Iris Cohen

Teachers

Grade 1 - David Krupp
Stephanie Steinberg
Vincenza Pizzulli
Madelyn Kassof
Jeffrey Schwager

P.S. 396

District Superintendent - Mr. Saul Siegal
Principal - Mr. David Marcus
Coordinator - Mr. Harvey Weil, Asst. Principal

Teachers

Grade 1 - Rena Daure
Marcia Weissler
Lula Frohberg
Priscilla Perlman

Early Childhood Staff Member:
Mrs. Ruth Kligman

School Staff in Project (continued)

P.S. 17

District Superintendent - Mr. Ralph Brande
Principal - Dr. Harold Simon
Coordinator - Miss Helen Maiwald - Asst. Principal

Teachers

Grade 1 - Sharron Hartman
Ellen Natelli
Filomena Fonte
Vesper Kydd
Evelyn Springer
Nora Sacerdote

3.5.3. Bronx

P.S. 5

District Superintendent - Dr. Bernard Friedman
Principal - Mr. Jacques Weissler
Coordinator - Miss Helen Schenker, Asst. Principal

Teachers

Grade 1 - Iris Schneider
Susan Budnick
Barbara Mendelson
Ruth Fishbein
Mary Tucker
Eleanor Press
Virginia Tashjian
Isabel Litterman

Grade 2 - Jean Cinelli
Karl Vallone
Irene Krauss
Jane Spielberger
Emilia Kozimiroff
Lorraine Petrelli
Lois Girdharry
Frieda Weintraub

3.6 Evaluation Staff in Project

Dr. J. Wayne Wrightstone, Assistant Superintendent
Bureau of Educational Research
Dr. Philip Bolger, Acting Research Associate,
Bureau of Educational Research
Mr. Luis Rivera, Research Intern

4. ADVISORY STAFF

4.1 New York State

Esther Swanker, Assistant Director, Urban Aid for Education

4.2 Southwest Educational Development Laboratory

Dr. Elizabeth Ott, Consultant, Curriculum and Implementation
Dr. Robert Randall, Consultant, Research and Evaluation

5. ACTION - 1968-69

5.1 Summer 1968 Program, Texas

5.1.1 Project Director

The Project Director, Eugene C. Gibney, participated in curriculum development sessions at the Southwest Educational Development Laboratories, Austin, Texas, for a five-week period.

In August, the director also attended a Teacher-Training Workshop conducted by Mr. Josue Gonzales, director of the project in San Antonio, Texas.

5.1.2 Demonstration Teachers

The demonstration teachers, Miss Ruth Calderon and Mrs. Aida Mora, attended the Bilingual Institute at St. Mary's University, in San Antonio, Texas. This Institute was under the direction of the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

The two teachers received information concerning the background (cultural, sociological, economic, and other aspects) of Spanish-speaking children. In addition, demonstrations were given in the use of the materials and methods relating to the project materials.

5.2 Teacher-Supervisory Training Program, New York City

5.2.1 Workshops for Demonstration Teachers

Workshops for demonstration teachers were held at 110 Livingston Street, beginning in September, 1968. Information relating to schools in the project, assign-

ments and responsibilities was given. Training was provided for Mrs. Helen Spevack and Mrs. Priscilla Perlman, newly-assigned demonstration teachers, at workshops and through teaching demonstrations. Materials were distributed (see Items No. 1 through 5 attached). Regular monthly meetings are held with the demonstration teachers and the Spanish-speaking teachers to discuss progress. Minutes of these meetings are available.

5.2.2 Meetings with Supervisors

Meetings with the supervisors in the pilot schools have been held. Many supervisors have attended workshops in order to learn more about the program. The director of the project has also visited all supervisors of the five control schools cooperating with the project.

5.2.3 General Orientation Meetings for Total School Staff

Because of the disruption of regular school activities resulting from the fall work stoppage, no attempt was made during the fall to utilize a school conference for staff orientation to the program. The project director has initiated meetings for the spring term.

5.2.4 Visitation and Observation Record

Helene M. Lloyd, Assistant Superintendent, and Eugene C. Gibney, Project Director, made the following visitations and observations:

January 13, 1969 - P.S. 19-K
Teachers observed: (In attendance: Mr. Levine)
Miss Samberg
Miss Gaudiosi

January 22, 1969 - P.S. 102-M
Teachers Observed: (In attendance: Mrs.Peebles)
Miss Gold
Miss Pellettieri
Mrs. Subkoff
Mrs. Mingo
Miss Rosen

January 23, 1969 - P.S. 180-M
Teachers Observed: (In attendance: Mr. Weinstein)
Miss Beach
Mrs. Fechter
Miss Marketos
Miss Daly

January 24, 1969 - P.S. 19-K
Teachers Observed: (In attendance: Mrs. Goldberg)
Miss Eskolsky
Miss Lerer
Mrs. Rabinowitz
Mrs. Lippe

January 24, 1969 - P.S. 5-X
Teachers Observed: (In attendance: Miss Schenker)
Mrs. Litterman
Mrs. Fishbein
Miss Mendelson
Mrs. Cinelli

January 27, 1969 - P.S. 17-K
Teachers Observed: (In attendance: Miss Maiwold)
Mrs. Hartman
Mrs. Natelli
Mrs. Springer
Mrs. Sacerdote

5.3 Visitation to San Antonio, Texas

5.3.1 The following New York City staff visited the San Antonio School system on January 15-17, 1969, inclusive. Observations and discussions under the direction of Dr. Elizabeth Ott, SEDL, and Dr. Gonzales, Director of the Project in San Antonio, were most beneficial.

Dr. Bernard E. Donovan, Superintendent
Mrs. Esther Swanker, Assistant Director, Urban Aid for Education
Mrs. Helene M. Lloyd, Assistant Superintendent
Mr. Eugene C. Gibney, Director, Language Development Project
Mr. Max Weinstein Principal, P.S. 180M
Mrs Bernice Peebles, Principal, P.S. 102M
Mr. Harry Levine, Principal, P.S. 19K
Mr. Carlos Perez, Bilingual Coordinator, State Department of Education

5.4 Visitation by SEDL Staff to New York City

5.4.1 Dr. Elizabeth Ott, Program Director of SEDL, observed the Language Development Project in New York City schools on January 28, 29 and 30, 1969, according to the schedules attached. (See Items 6, 7 and 8). Meetings were held after the observations, at which time Doctor Ott discussed the lessons observed and made suggestions for improving the program. The principals, coordinators and demonstration teachers were present and were given an opportunity to ask questions and to make comments. Dr. Ralph Brande, District Superintendent, attended the observations and conference at P.S. 19K.

5.4.2 Dr. Robert Randall visited New York City on January 30, and reviewed the design for evaluation with the following in attendance:

Dr. Elizabeth Ott (SEDL), Mrs. Baker (N. Y. State, Office of Research), Dr. J. Wayne Wrightstone, Assistant Superintendent, Helene M. Lloyd, Dr. Phillip Bolger, Mr. Luis Rivera and Mr. Eugene C. Gibney.

Later, the 1967-68 preliminary evaluation report was discussed with Dr. Randall and Dr. Bolger.

5.5 Classroom Assistance

5.5.1 During the fall term, the demonstration teachers devoted most of the day to working directly in the classrooms. Samples of the December time schedules of the demonstration teachers are attached. (See Items 9, 10 and 11). The demonstration teachers gave lessons, utilizing certain techniques such as Modeling and Repetition, while the regular teachers observed. It is expected that demonstration teachers will later observe the progress of the regular teachers in mastering the language development techniques and discuss their lessons with them.

The project director started observing teaching as of December 17, 1968, at P.S. 180 Manhattan. Observations were delayed due to the work stoppage.

5.6 In-Service Training

5.6.1 Staff Training Profile - September 1968-January 1969

	New Teachers	Trained Teachers	Total, New and Trained Teachers
Brooklyn			
P.S. 156	5	0	
P.S. 175	5	0	
P.S. 396	5	0	
P.S. 17	5	0	
P.S. 19	16	0	
Subtotal	36	0	Brooklyn: 36
Manhattan			
P.S. 96	7	7	
P.S. 102	3	8	
P.S. 180	6	6	
Subtotal	16	21	Manhattan: 37
Bronx			
P.S. 5	9	8	
Subtotal	9	8	Bronx: 17
Total New Teachers	61	Total Trained Teachers 29	Total All Teachers 90

5.6.2 Workshops have been held as follows:*

Date	Schools Involved	Place	Time	Workshop No.
10/3 68	396-K, 175-K, 156-K	396-K	3:15-5:00 PM	1
10/3/68	19-K, 17-K	19-K	8:40-10:40 PM	1
10/7/68	5-X	5-X	3:15-5:00 PM	1
10/8/68	96-M, 102-M, 180-M	96-M	3:15-5:00 PM	1
10/9/68	396-K, 175-K, 156-K	396-K	3:15-5:00 PM	2
10/9. 68	19-K, 17-K	19-K	8:40-9:40 AM	2
10/10/68	19-K, 17-K	19-K	8:40-9:40 AM 1:30-3:30 PM	2
11/25 68	96-M, 102-M, 180-M	96-M	3:15-5:00 PM	2
11/26. 68	5-X	5-X	3:15-5:00 PM	2
12. 2, 68	5-X	5-X	3:15-5:00 PM	3
12 3/68	396-K, 175-K, 156-K	396-K	3:15-5:00 PM	3
12/5. 68	19-K, 17-K	19-K	8:00-9:40 AM 1:30-3:30 PM	3
12/9/68	96-M, 102-M, 180-M	96-M	3:15-5:00 PM	3
12/16/68	5-X	5-X	3:15-5:00 PM	4
12 17. 68	96-M, 102-M, 180-M	96-M	3:15-5:00 PM	4
1/8/69	396-K, 175-K, 156-K	396-K	3:15-5:00 PM	4
1/9/69	19-K	19-K	8:10-10:10 AM 1:30-3:30 PM	4
1/13/69	180-M	180-M	3:15-5:00 PM	5
1/20/69	5-X	5-X	3:15-5:00 PM	5
1. 21/69	17-K	17-K	3:15-5:00 PM	4
1/22 69	396-K	396-K	3:15-5:00 PM	5
1/23 69	19-K	19-K	8:10-10:10 AM 1:30-3:30 PM	5

* Separate workshops were held initially for teachers new to the project.

5.6.3 Because of travel problems and other difficulties, workshops are now planned in individual schools in all districts except 17, Brooklyn. Workshop attendance has increased. Discussions now focus on problems of the particular school or class, resulting in a high level of interest among the workshop participants.

5.6.4 In addition to school-based workshops, a special workshop was held on Wednesday, December 18, 1968, at which time Dr. Robert Allen of Teachers College, Columbia University, discussed linguistics and language learning. A question and answer period allowed time for practical inquiries from the teachers. A tape made of Dr. Allen's talk will be used at workshop sessions in the schools during the spring term.

5.6.5 Work with Hunter College - An attempt was made to set up a special course in the use of the project's materials and approaches at Hunter College for the Spring 1969 term. A meeting was held with Professor Milton Gold, Dean of Teacher Education, Hunter College, to plan a course related to the project. Professor Gold has not been able to provide a staff member who is not directly connected with the Board of Education to assist with the project. Dr. Finnochiaro, formerly assigned, is on leave. Mrs. Clelia Belfrom, staff member of the Board and a part-time instructor at Hunter College, is now giving a course on English as a Second Language. Five of the project teachers have enrolled for this course and Mrs. Belfrom will include the San Antonio Project in the course of study.

5.6.6 Assistance from Spanish-Speaking Teacher - Four Spanish-speaking teachers, Mrs. Ada DiScipio, Miss Isabel Velez, Mr. Arthur Nieves and Miss Filomena Fonte have been recruited. They will begin teaching Spanish in project classes in February, 1969. It is planned that classes under their instruction will receive five lessons a week, using the same science curriculum as will classes taught in English. Note: Difficulty was experienced in obtaining Spanish-speaking teachers; contacts were made with the following people at regular intervals: Mr. Jose Vasquez, Mrs. Carmen Dinos and Mrs. Clelia Belfrom of the Board staff; Mr. Rodriguez of the Puerto Rican Educators; and Miss Gloria Abad of Aspira, Inc.

6. MATERIALS

6.1 Two-Dimensional Shapes - These materials were purchased from the Cardcraft Company, New York City, and sent by the company to five key schools for redistribution to all schools in the project.

6.2 Three-Dimensional Shapes - The Manpower Development Center cooperated in making these shapes for the project without charge. The Center was most cooperative. These shapes are being delivered to all Brooklyn schools.

6.3 All teachers in the project have the manuals and foldouts they need to implement the project.

6.4 The Director and Demonstration Teachers have constructed other materials for use by the pupils and/or the teachers for numerous lessons in grade 1 and 2 science and self-concept. They are distributed as teachers take up those lessons.

6.5 Spanish Science Manuals have been ordered from SEDL for the Spanish-speaking teachers.

7. EVALUATION

7.1 Evaluation, 1967-68. The Bureau of Educational Research has released the attached Summary Evaluation of the project for the school year 1967-68. (See Item 12).

7.2 Evaluation Design, 1968-69. The Design for Evaluation, 1968-69, is attached. (See Item 13).

8. A LOOK AHEAD

8.1 Teacher Training will continue to be held primarily in individual schools so that attendance is encouraged and greater individualization is provided. This means that more time will be spent in the field by the director beginning in late January. It is planned that whenever a workshop is to be held in a school, the director will visit the classrooms sometime that day to observe the project in action. Time during the workshop will be devoted to a brief discussion of observations.

A training film obtained from SEDL will be used to train teachers in the coding of the language techniques. Graphing the observed method will be part of the training and through the use of the film, discussion of the techniques should heighten interest.

Future plans in in-service training include the use of the "Teacher Education Package." This package includes a video-tape recorder, microphone, tapes, earphones, and viewer. One of these video tape recorder systems has been ordered for each school in the project and should be in the schools in April, 1969. The Guided Self-Analysis Codes of Doctors Ott and Parsons will then be creatively put to work by the individual teachers in the schools.

8.2 Evaluation - Two special testing units are on order and will be used in the Spring to administer the Ott test of Spoken English, Revised Form. Each unit consists of eight tape recorders mounted on a cart along with a master tape unit and a carousel projector. The microphones are very sensitive up to three inches away, so that they can pick up the slightest whispered response while not recording background noise. On December 5, this equipment was tested at P.S. 19, Brooklyn under very adverse conditions, yet responses could be heard and scores obtained from them. Dr. Robert Randall (SEDL), Mrs. Beth Kennedy (SEDL), Dr. Phillip Bolger, Mr. Luis Rivera, Mr. Gibney, and Mr. Buck of Sonocraft Company, were present at this test. Two systems are on order.

8.3 Summer, 1969 - Recruitment of two or three teachers to work in Texas during the summer will begin in February, 1969. The demonstration teachers would be a valuable contribution to the writing workshop in Austin, Texas. In addition, several key

people in the schools will be recruited to attend Leadership Conferences during the summer of 1969. The Director plans to attend these Conferences, also.

8.4 Parent-Community Involvement - This spring, meetings will be held with parents and community members in order to explain the project and answer questions. Children will be involved in demonstration lessons.

Articles with photographs will be written for Spanish newspapers, such as El Diario and the cooperation of the Spanish Radio Station, WADO, will be sought in presenting a special program about the Language Development Project.

8.5 Staff - The Project Director will continue to interview teachers (demonstration and bilingual) interested in joining the project in the fall, 1969. He will also discuss extension of the program with district superintendents and principals.

ITEM NO. 1
Demonstration
Teacher #1

BOARD OF EDUCATION
LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE DEMONSTRATION TEACHER

Prepared by Eugene Gibney

1. To Supervisors, Principals, Assistant Principals

   1.1. Establish rapport.
   1.2. Explain rationale of the program.
   1.3. Work with assigned supervisor to encourage teacher growth.
   1.4. Maintain records of visits to the schools.
   1.5. Attend staff conferences during the year to explain the program to the entire staff and to build support.

2. To Teachers

   2.1. Establish rapport.
   2.2. Explain the rationale of the program.
   2.3. Demonstrate techniques used in the Language Development Program in the classroom with teachers observing each demonstration for a particular purpose such as modeling.
   2.4. Establish understanding by teachers in the schools that visits and demonstrations are made to develop the program, not to harass teachers. The approach is one of giving help, not making reports. Teaching techniques are not being rated.
   2.5. Keep records of demonstrations.
   2.6. Schedule demonstrations for the teachers of the school.
   2.7. Schedule follow-up observations of teachers who have observed certain techniques.
   2.8. Demonstrate the use of audio-visual material.
   2.9. Demonstrate the use of the Teacher Education package, (video-tape unit), as a self-improvement device.
   2.10. Explain to teachers in the project that visits will be made to the schools during the year by the staff of the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory and by the Coordinator. Instruction should continue as usual during such visits.

3. To Pupils

   3.1. Establish rapport with the pupils involved in the program.
   3.2. Teach English to classes of pupils while demonstrating a particular technique.
   3.3. Enhance the position of the regular class teacher in the Language Development Project through your attitudes and remarks.
   3.4. Praise pupils for making real progress in learning standard English patterns.

4. To Parents and Community Groups

4.1. Explain the values of the program in either English or Spanish, or both.
4.2. Build parental support for the program through personal contacts and through meetings with groups of parents.

5. To the Coordinator

5.1. Submit a plan for the demonstrations which will be given in each school. The name of the teacher, time, date, and room number should be part of the plan.
5.2. Submit a progress report by December, 1968, which will include the number of demonstrations given, observations for teacher growth made, the number of parent contacts, community contacts, and a general statement about the reception by those concerned with the program. A form will be supplied for this purpose.
5.3. Report to the coordinator any special problems which might endanger the success of the program.
5.4. Report to the coordinator both positive and negative reactions by parents, pupils, teachers, or supervisors, with the view that this will help overcome objections and aid in the dissemination of information to SEDL for modification of the program to suit the needs of pupils in New York City.
5.5. Meet with the coordinator on a regular monthly basis to discuss problems and to develop improved plans for coordinating and implementing the program. The suggestions and comments of demonstration teachers are encouraged.
5.6. Help with the planning of in-service training of new teachers to the program and teachers with some training in the program.

6. Summary

6.1. The demonstration teacher in the Language Development Program is a key person. It is most important that a sound professional and interested posture be manifested at all times. Good human relations is part of this posture. What the demonstration teacher does in the school will be discussed by all the teachers, not only those in the project. Let us give them good, positive, and exciting material to talk about in a constructive way. You will be a model. Just as we insist in our program that children hear and repeat perfect models, so should the demonstration teacher be an excellent model for the teachers looking to her for training and encouragement. I have every confidence in each of you.

Eugene C. Gibney
Coordinator
Language Development Project

9/11/68
lk

ITEM NO. 2
D.T. #2

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT
110 Livingston Street - Brooklyn, New York

PROGRESS REPORT FORM
Demonstration Teacher

To: Mr. Eugene C. Gibney, Coordinator

From: _____

Dates Covered by Report: From _____ To _____

School Reported On: P.S. _____ (Note: Use separate form for each school)

---

1. Number of demonstrations given . . . . . _____
   1.1. Techniques demonstrated to date:

2. Number of observations made . . . . . _____

3. Number of meetings or consultations with teachers _____

4. Number of parents with whom you spoke regarding program . . . . . _____

5. Number of community people or groups with whom you spoke about the program . . . . . _____

6. Comment on teacher reception to the program and growth in using the approaches and materials.

7. Comment on pupils' growth as a result of using the program.

8. What problems do you have on which help is needed?

9. Other comments.

ITEM NO. 3
D.T. #3

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT
110 Livingston Street - Brooklyn, New York

Helene Lloyd, Asst. Supt. Eugene C. Gibney, Director

Demonstration Teachers

The following dates should be kept free for a morning meeting of Demonstration teachers and Spanish Speaking teachers in Room 918A at 110 Livingston Street. The meetings will start at 9:30 a.m. All are scheduled on the last school Friday of the month.

September 27, 1968
October 25, 1968
November 22, 1968
December 20, 1968
January 31, 1969
February 28, 1969
March 28, 1969
April 25, 1969
May 30, 1969

These meetings will be utilized as a planning session for training workshops, use of demonstration teachers' time, and for resolving problems and generally improving the Language Development Program in the schools.

Eugene C. Gibney
Director
Language Development Program

lk
9/68

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT
110 Livingston Street - Brooklyn, New York

ITEM NO. #4

Helene M. Lloyd, Asst. Supt.

Eugene C. Gibney, Director

Spanish Speaking Teacher

Pattern of School Visits: (Circle days scheduled for schools assigned)

P.S.____ M T W TH F

P.S.____ M T W TH F

P.S.____ M T W TH F

Name of Teacher_____

Month_____

Monthly Schedule (Spanish Lessons)

First Week	Second Week	Third Week	Fourth Week	Conference, Meetings, etc.
Monday	Monday	Monday	Monday	1st week
Tuesday	Tuesday	Tuesday	Tuesday	2nd week
Wednesday	Wednesday	Wednesday	Wednesday	3rd week
Thursday	Thursday	Thursday	Thursday	4th week
Friday	Friday	Friday	Friday	Comments

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
110 Livingston Street - Brooklyn, New York

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

Public School 102 Manhattan

Mr. Martin Frey, District Superintendent
Mrs. Bernice Peebles, Principal
Mrs. Shirley Selikson, Assistant Principal
Mrs. Aida Mora, Demonstration Teacher

Visitations

January 28, 1969 1:15 - 2:45 p.m.

Prekindergarten (Not part of the official project. Teacher is emphasizing oral language patterns.)

Teacher . . . . . Mrs. Mingo (2½ years experience)
Class . . . . . 16 children, 75% Spanish-speaking
Lesson. . . . . Self-concept: To develop concepts of school and school activities.

Kindergarten

Teacher . . . . . Mrs. Vertes (10 years experience)
Class . . . . . 18 children, 75% Spanish-speaking
Lesson. . . . . Self-concept: To review names and addresses; to develop concepts of school and school activities.

Grade 1

Teacher . . . . . Miss Pellettieri (1½ years experience)
Class . . . . . 24 children, 33% Spanish-speaking
Lesson. . . . . Math and Science: To apply relationship of same and different in discriminating among shapes.

Grade 1

Teacher . . . . . Mrs. Subkoff (1½ years experience)
Class . . . . . 27 children, 60% Spanish-speaking
Lesson. . . . . Math and Science: To discriminate among shapes by size.

Grade 2

Teacher . . . . . Mrs. Gold (10 years experience)
Class . . . . . 22 children, 50% Spanish-speaking
Lesson. . . . . Math and Science: To develop an understanding of symmetry and to apply this understanding to two-dimensional shapes; to reinforce the concept of shape.

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
110 Livingston Street - Brooklyn, New York

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

Public School 17, Brooklyn

Mr. Ralph Brande, District Superintendent
Dr. Harold Simon, Principal
Mrs. Helen Maiwald, Assistant Principal assigned to Project
Mrs. Helen Spevack, Demonstration Teacher

Visitations

January 29, 1969 1:15 - 2:45 p.m.

Ethnic Population of School: Fall, 1968

84.5%	Puerto Rican
6.7%	Negro
6.4%	White

Class 1.1. (303) Mrs. Sharon Hartman Register 31

Children all English speaking; some with prekindergarten experience; all have some kindergarten experience; more mature group.

Lesson: To teach plurals, same and different.

Class 1.2. (307) Mrs. Ellen Natelli Register 30

Children speak English in varying degrees; less than half have had some kindergarten experience; wide range of maturity.

Lesson: To teach plurals, same and different.

Class 1.3. (209) Miss Filomena Fonte Register 30

Children speak English in varying degrees; ten have had some kindergarten experience; wide range of maturity.

Lesson: To teach the concept of self in relation to others and to school.

Class 1.4. (203) Mrs. Vesper Kydd Register 27

Most children just beginning to speak English; three with some kindergarten experience; six with about six-year old maturity; others immature; some emotional problems.

Lesson: To teach differences among circle, triangle and square.

Class 1.5. (302) Mrs. Evelyn Springer Register 28

All children non-English speaking; some with a little kindergarten experience; very immature; some emotional problems.

Lesson: To teach children to recognize a rectangle

Class 1.6. (307) Mrs. Nora Sacerdote Register 27

All children non-English speaking; a few with a little kindergarten experience; very immature; some emotional problems.

Lesson: To teach the concept of personal identity.

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
110 Livingston Street - Brooklyn, New York

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

Public School 19, Brooklyn

Mr. Ralph Brande, District Superintendent
Mr. Harry Levine, Principal
Mrs. Lee Goldberg, Assistant Principal assigned to Project
Mrs. Anita Bergman, Teacher, School Coordinator of Project
Mrs. Helen Spevack, Demonstration Teacher

Visitations

January 30, 1969 9:30 - 11:45 a.m.

Objective of Lessons: To review the language patterns taught during the past month.

Grade 1

Teacher . . . . . Mrs. Lippe

Class 1.1. . . . All Spanish-speaking but 1 Cninese pupil. Six non-English studerts. One Negro child rarely speaks. All, except the 6 non-English speaking pupils, had kindergarten experience.

Teacher . . . . . Mrs. Rabinowitz

Class 1.3. . . . All Spanish-speaking. Ten are non-English speaking. Ten had kindergarten experience.

Teacher . . . . . Miss Gloria Wirtz

Class 1.5. . . . All Spanish-speaking. Fifteen are non-English speaking pupils with no kindergarten experience.

Teacher . . . . . Mrs. Carol Winkler

Class 1.9. . . . All Spanish-speaking. Except for one child, all are non-English-speaking. Five had kindergarten experience. One child is a stutterer.

Teachers . . . . .Mrs. Charlotte Lerer (1.11)
Mrs. Arlene Goldhammer (1.12)

Classes 1.11 and 1.12 . . All Spanish-speaking. Twenty pupils out of 32 are non-English speaking. No pupils had kindergarten experience.

Teachers . . . . . Miss Cathy Cirrito (1.15)
Miss Victoria Eskolsky (1.16)

Classes 1.15 and 1.16 . . . All Spanish-speaking except one. All non-English except one. No pupils had kindergarten experience.

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
Bernard E. Donovan, Superintendent of Schools

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH
J. Wayne Wrightstone, Assistant Superintendent

AN EVALUATION OF THE LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

First Year Report
(1967 - 1968)

Prepared by

Philip A. Bolger
Howard Tilis
Luis Rivera

BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH
Samuel D. McClelland, Acting Director
George Forlano, Assistant Administrative Director

March 1969

Evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; (PL 89-10).

PREFACE

This report of March, 1969: An Evaluation of The Language Development Project; First Year Report (1967-1968), is a revised version of the first report concerning this project which was published in January, 1969. The latter report was entitled: The Evaluation of the Language Development Project; A Preliminary Report.

The present report contains those amendations and additions to the preliminary report resulting from discussion of the preliminary report by all parties concerned.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	Introduction	1
	Federal funding	1
	History of the project	1
	Southwest Educational Development Laboratory	2
	The Language Development Project	2
	The New York City Version	2
II	The Survey of Teachers	4
	Preparation and training	4
	Administrative aspects	6
	Curriculum implementation	7
	Teacher evaluation	9
III	The Experimental Study	18
	Major questions	18
	Procedures	19
	Findings	19
	Subdivision 1 - L.C.I. - Criterion	20
	Subdivision 2 - Metropolitan Reading-Criterion	22
	Subdivision 3 - Ott-Jameson - Criterion	23
	Subdivision 4 - Puerto R ican Scale "A" Scores	24
IV	Conclusions	25
	From Teacher Survey	25
	From Experimental Study	27
V	Interpretation	28
	APPENDIX A - The Teacher Questionnaire	32

CHAPTER I

Introduction

The federal government through Title I, ESEA auspices sponsored several programs in New York C ity for the school year 1967-1968 in the area of Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages. Among those sponsored were the Language Development Project, The Merrill Project, The Miami Project, The Cluster Teaching Program, The District Coordinator Program, and a special Recruitment Program. The Bureau of Educational Research of the New York City Board of Education was assigned the responsibility of evaluating these projects funded under the title: Improving the Teaching of English As A Second Language in Grades K-6. This report is confined to the Language Development Project (The Texas Study) as implemented during the school year 1967-1968. It is proposed that this project will be operative two more years, but henceforth its funding will come through the New York State Urban Education Act. A second year evaluation report is scheduled for the 1968-1969 school year with a final evaluation report, embracing the three year experience, scheduled for 1970.

The suggestion for implementing the Language Development Project in New York City initiated as a result of a visit to San Antonio, Texas, by Mrs. Esther Swanker of the New York State Education Department. Her positive impressions resulting from observation of the Language Development Project as operative in San Antonio lead to an invitation to witness the project being extended to the New York City Superintendent of Schools, Dr. Bernard E. Donovan. In the Spring of 1967, Dr. Donovan, and Acting Deputy Superintendent Helene Lloyd accompanied by several members of the New York City Board of Education's administrative and teaching staff visited San Antonio to witness the demonstration lessons planned. The favorable impression made resulted in a proposal being written to fund a tryout of the Language Development Project in New York City. Mr. Charles Miras, an assistant principal, was selected to be Project Director in New York City. He administered

and supervised the initial implementation of the project during the 1967-1968 school year.

The Language Development Program is a product of the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, one of fifteen regional centers sponsored by local and federal funds. Under the general management of Dr. Edwin Hindsman, Executive Director of the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, the Language Development Program was primarily developed by Dr. Elizabeth Ott, Program Director and co-originator of the Ott-Jameson Test. Technical developments were supervised by Dr. Robert Randall, Associate Director of the Southwest Development Laboratory.

The Language Development Project, an oral-aural approach to teaching English, is designed to provide assistance to disadvantaged children who are learning English as a second language or who use non-standard speech patterns. SEDL materials in the areas of self-concept and science are being used in the New York City project. Children use the special language material in these areas on a daily basis. The pupils receive assistance in language development during the other instructional lessons. The material has been programmed for 60 minutes of use each day in Grade 1; this time allotment is allowed to be broken up into two or three time units with intervening activities of a non-program nature occurring. During program activities the teacher is required to use the structured lesson plans provided.

The New York City version of the project was scheduled to begin with a teacher training program during the Summer of 1967 preceding actual implementation in four experimental schools during the school year, 1967-1968. The Bureau of Educational Research of the New York City Board of Education was assigned primary responsibility for implementing a plan of evaluation; it was to work cooperatively with the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory concerning selected aspects of the evaluation such as scoring

and administration of the Ott-Jameson Test. It was to consult with concerned parties when results were available and to provide evaluation reports.

CHAPTER 2

THE SURVEY OF TEACHERS

THE POPULATION: Teacher questionnaires concerning the Language Development Project were sent to 36 teachers in three schools conducting the project among predominately Spanish-background children. Returns were received from 30 teachers. School "A" had 4 first-grades taught by 8 teachers. School "B" had 5 first-grade classes taught by 10 teachers. School "C" had 9 first-grade classes taught by 18 teachers. Questionnaires returned from Schools "A", "B" and "C" were, respectively, 7, 9, and 15; in all, 31 questionnaires were returned. Five teachers failed to return questionnaires. One of the 15 questionnaires returned from School "C" was from a teacher who had replaced the original teacher late in the term. This questionnaire is excluded from any analysis that would require a length of time for sufficient experience to answer a particular item.

THE FINDINGS: Question "1" to "4" of the Teacher Questionnaire made inquiries concerning teacher preparation and training for the project. A closed-ended type item was used (see Appendix A for this and all other items subsequently reported in this Part). Table 1 indicates the frequency of responses for the 30 responding teachers to the first four items.

Table 1

The Number and Percentage of Selections Made for the First Four Items by 30 Teachers

ITEM	RESPONSES "Yes" No.	%	"No" No.	%	No Response No.	%
1. Have you taken any college courses for preparation to teach in this program?	4	13%	24	80%	2	7%
2. Have you taken any special in-service training for preparation to teach in this program?	10	33%	18	60%	2	7%
3. Has there been any systematic follow-up ... that you may function more effectively in this program?	25	83%	4	13%	1	4%
4. Have you been given adequate help in conducting the program in your classroom by the						
project director	14	46%	2	7%	15	50%
district coordinator.	15	50%	2	7%	13	43%
by others	12	40%	1	4%	16	56%

The table indicates that the majority of teacher respondents had neither college courses directly relevant to this type program nor in-service training in preparation for this program. One-third of the teachers did, however, attend the preparatory in-service program, while 83% reported systematic follow-up during the year designed to help them function more effectively in the program. While approximately half the teachers reported receiving adequate help in conducting the program from the project director, district coordinator and others, there is an exceptionally large number of teachers who failed to respond to this item. An atypical set of statistics such as these located in a sequence of responses with highly different frequencies cautions the reader concerning the judgment he makes concerning the adequacy of help received.

Questions "5", "6", and "7" concerned administrative aspects of the program. Question "5" requested that teachers indicate when the program got into "full swing" in their schools. This question was necessitated because of the atypical school inception experienced in New York during September, 1967. Responses indicated that in 2 classes the program began in September, in 11 classes the program began in October, in 11 other classes the program began in November; four responses indicated a full program later than November. The program was not underway in most schools until November. These statistics are reflective of the local troubles that year. Responses reported are in terms of classes as they were administratively arranged that year. A first grade class consisted of approximately 15 children with one teacher. This arrangement was necessitated because of the agreement with the union. Unfortunately there were not enough classrooms to house each class as an independent unit. This necessitated housing two classes of 15 children each with each class having its own teacher in the same room. Question "6" requested teachers to comment concerning whether they thought this arrangement impeded program implementation. Three teachers felt that it did; 20 claimed it did not; 7 made no response. The majority felt the special teaching arrangement did not hamper the success of the program. Question "7" consisted of two parts each addressing itself to the articulation problem. In item 7a teachers were asked whether or not they thought the child would be hampered if he transferred into another class during the term. Four teachers thought not; 19 teachers believed the child would have problems; 8 made no response. In item 7b the teachers were asked if they thought the child would be hindered next year if he was placed into a second grade class that did not have the Language Development Program.

Seven teachers thought the child would have trouble; 20 believed he would not; 5 made no response. The majority of the teachers thought that a child transferred from their experimental class to another class during the year would have difficulty, but that a child going into a regular non-program second grade class next year would not have difficulty adjusting.

Questions "8", "9", "10" and "12" concerned curriculum implementation. Question "8" requested teachers to indicate the amount of time they devoted to the Language Development Program in the school day. Table 2 indicates the responses.

Table 2

Units of Time Devoted to Implementing the Language Development Project Materials During the Usual School Day; Responses from 30 Project Teachers

Intervals of Time During Which Project Was Implemented	Number of Teachers Reporting
Up to 15 minutes	2
Up to 20 minutes	8
Up to 25 minutes	1
Up to 30 minutes	12
Up to 35 minutes	0
Up to 40 minutes	5
Up to 45 minutes	1
Up to 50 minutes	1

The table indicates that the modal teacher used the program for 30 minutes each day; it also indicates that more than half the teachers implemented the program 30 minutes or less each day. Only 7 teachers reported using the program more than 30 minutes. (The standard for use was one hour per day).

Question "9" sought to determine the extent, if any, to which the teachers were varying from the use of the curriculum materials as described in the teacher's manual. Fifteen teachers reported using the materials as in the manual; 13 teachers reported using variations; 2 teachers made no response. Variations reported or explained by those making such variations referred to such modifications as:

____ simplifying the vocabulary
____ adjusting because of inability to secure all materials
____ using the same language patterns with the other areas
____ omitting certain techniques
____ using additional audio-visual materials
____ employing class rather than individual instruction
____ including additional activities

There seemed to be no general rule concerning variations, where made; they appear to be local decisions rather than adaptations made as the result of some general function of the program. It is not known to what extent these revisions were made nor how long they took place. They could very well represent a vitiation of the experimental factor if made in critical areas. It is notable that nearly half the teachers made some variations in employing the materials. Such a large percentage of teachers reporting variations suggest that the project be reviewed concerning its potential for intact implementation in a large urban area; it is also suggested that the administrative procedure be examined concerning program implementation.

Question "10" inquired of the teachers whether they thought the curriculum material should be used with classes grouped homogeneously according to English speaking disability or heterogeneously among all Spanish-background students. As implemented this term classes were heterogeneously grouped regarding English language disability. Seventeen teachers indicated

a preference for homogeneous grouping, whereas 13 teachers thought the heterogeneous grouping arrangement suitable. Those favoring homogeneous grouping offered as their reasons:

____ less linguistically handicapped children become bored
____ lessons would be more interesting for each sub-group
____ faster learners would benefit more
____ evaluation would be easier

Those favoring heterogeneous grouping offered as their reasons:

____ children benefit by association with those of different abilities
____ academic differences are not so pronounced in first grade
____ small group instruction within the class can be given

The pros and cons here are those generally offered concerning homogeneous grouping in almost any subject; they are not necessarily responses endemic to the program. Teachers are about equally divided on this issue.

Question "11" concerned the durability of curriculum materials. Sixteen teachers thought the materials sufficiently durable; 13 thought the materials were not durable; one teacher made no response. A large minority of teachers thought the curriculum materials should be improved regarding this aspect.

Question "12" requested teachers to indicate whether or not they thought the curriculum materials were easily adaptable to the individual needs of the children taught. Seventeen teachers selected a "yes" response, 12 teachers selected a "no" response and one teacher did not respond. Although a majority of the teachers felt the curriculum materials were adequate in terms of the adaptation function, a large minority felt the materials were not easily adapted to the individual needs of the children in their classes.

Question "13" to "18" concerned teacher evaluation of the program. Question "13" requested that teachers indicate in what ways the children profited from participation in the program. Each of the 29 responding

teachers was allowed to list as many positive features as they desired. The following items were those mentioned by responding teachers:

Frequency of Mention	Positive Value
10 teachers	The children answered in or used complete sentences.
7 "	The children learned correct language patterns.
5 "	The children mastered correct pronunciation.
4 "	The children's vocabulary improved.
4 "	The children learned basic math concepts.
3 "	The children developed confidence in using the language.
3 "	The children enjoyed the experience.
2 "	No positive experiences; frustrating the children.

According to the teachers the most commonly experienced positive aspect of the program was the ability of the children to use complete sentences; the next most common positive advantage in terms of teacher opinion was the children's learning correct language patterns. Neither of these most commonly mentioned positive experiences, were, however, indicated by more than a sizeable minority. Other positive experiences seemed to be indicative of local rather than general situations. Responses made to free-response type items such as Question "12" reflect the most general and most obvious experience of the respondent; secondary and less intense experiences are frequently unmentioned.

Question "14" requested that teachers indicate in what ways, if any, the children failed to profit from participation in this program. Again, an open-response type item was used. Only 18 teachers made entries; the remaining teachers indicated no negative experiences. Of the negative experiences

indicated by teachers the following was most frequently mentioned:

Frequency of Mention	Negative Experience
7 teachers	The children lost interest, especially those who had a better command of English.
3 "	The program was rigidly structured; not providing flexibility to meet needs of some children.

The fact that only 17 teachers responded concerning negative aspects indicates that nearly half the teachers had no complaints. Those who did complain tended to indict the lack of flexibility for individual differences and the inability to maintain interest among the brighter children. Both these negative experiences are functions of the heterogeneous grouping which placed children of varying degrees of ability in English within the same class. Such a grouping system covering a wide range of ability made it difficult to deal with the less linguistically handicapped children.

Question "15" and Question "16" asked teachers to indicate by means of responses to open-ended questions the positive advantages and disadvantages of the program. These questions are more comprehensive in content than Questions "14" and "13" which were restricted to positive and negative experiences concerning child growth. In listing responses to Question "15" (principal program advantages) the following were indicated:

Frequency of Mention	Indicated Program Advantage
9 Teachers	The structured nature of the program.
7 "	The development of confidence to speak among children.
6 "	No response made.
5 "	Rich math material.
2 "	No advantage seen in the program.
1 "	The emphasis upon reinforcement.
3 "	Improvement of speaking ability.

The plurality of favorable comments concerned the "programmed" nature of the material and the confidence it developed in children. These two most frequently mentioned positive advantages were made, however, by less than one-third of the teachers.

In listing responses to Question "16" (principal program disadvantages) the following were indicated:

Frequency of Mention	Indicated Program Disadvantages
18 Teachers	Irrelevant content lacking carry-over to other subject areas or lacking relationship to the life-experience of the child.
3 "	Concepts or vocabulary too difficult or too sophisticated for the children.
6 "	The children found it boring.
4 "	No response.
1 "	All negative; no discernible advantage.

A majority of the teachers complained that the curriculum content was irrelevant in terms of either educational transfer within school or in terms of use in the child's world. The indicated lack of transferability or utility was mentioned much more than any advantage of the program.

Question "17" requested teachers to rate the quality of cooperation they received from various personnel associated with the project. Each person associated with the project was rated on a five-point scale as indicated below:

5 - Excellent 4 - Good 3 - Fair 2 - Poor 1 - Very Poor

Table 3 indicates that in almost every case there is a large number of "No responses." This factor influences any interpreation that could be made of these data. Whether it was due to the fact that this questionnaire was not anonymous or that teachers did not wish to rate other professional personnel or that they did not feel free to indicate negative ratings is not known.

For those who did respond, the table indicates that cooperation was usually good or better from the principal, assistant principal, and all professional personnel connected with the program; the table also indicates that the cooperation from parents was not as good as that from professionals. Any of these indications must not be called conclusions because it is not known what effect the high number of non-respondents rating would have upon these indications had they responded.

Table 3

Teacher Estimates of Cooperation Received from Personnel Directly or Indirectly Related to The Language Development Project

	TEACHER ESTIMATES OF COOPERATION RECEIVED RATINGS					
	"Excellent	"Good"	"Fair"	"Poor"	"Very Poor"	NO RESPONSE
Person Rated	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.
Principal	10	8	2	1	2	8
Assistant Principal	6	10			2	12
English As A Second Language Teacher	13	8	1			9
District Coordinator	10	5	5			10
Parents	1	6	2	3	2	17
Other Teachers; Participating	6	8	1			18
Other Teachers Non-Participating	5	2	1			25
Project Director	15	5	1			10

Question "18" requested teachers to compare the conventional program with the experimental program in terms of aims, materials, learning theory, methodology, applicability to student needs, ease of teaching, pupil gain and pupil reaction. Only 13 of the teachers had experience with both the conventional method and the experimental method to enable them to complete this question. The other teachers (more than half) indicated they had never used the conventional program. This indicates that more than half the teachers had never taught before or that they had never used the conventional program.

This indicates that more than half the teachers had never taught before or that they had never used the conventional program in schools in which they had previously taught. The responses made by the 13 teachers who had experience in both programs were classified in terms of these three categories:

(a) the comparative statements concerning the aspect rated indicated that the CONVENTIONAL PROGRAM WAS SUPERIOR.

(b) the comparative statements concerning the aspect rated indicated that the EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM WAS SUPERIOR.

(c) the comparative statements concerning the aspect indicate NO DIFFERENCE.

The results for the 13 teachers capable of making comparative judgments are presented in Table 4. The table indicates the number of times teachers indicated a response favoring either of the programs or neither for each aspect rated.

Table 4

Frequency of Favorable, Unfavorable and Neutral Responses for the Conventional and Experimental Programs in Terms of Common Program Aspects

Aspects Rated by Teachers	Number of Times Conventional Program Favored	Number of Times Experimental Program Favored	Number of Times Responses Indicated No Difference
Program Aims	2	6	5
Program Materials	4	6	3
Learning Theory	4	5	4
Methodology	5	6	2
Suitability for Student Population	4	7	2
Ease of Teaching	4	7	2
Pupil Gain	3	7	3
Pupil Reaction	6	6	1

A plurality of the teachers who had experience with both programs rated the experimental program more favorable than the traditional program for 7

or 8 aspects rated; the only aspect rated which did not result in a plurality of the teachers favoring the experimental program was that of pupil reaction. Teachers indicated that the structured nature of the program implemented among heterogeneously grouped children made it boring for the more able. Statistics indicating superiority for the experimental program are from a plurality, not a majority of the teachers. The conventional program has strong minority support.

Question "19", a closed-ended item, requested teachers to indicate by checking one of three options what they thought the future of the experimental program should be. The three options offered were:

"continue unchanged" "continue with modification" (Please explain) "discontinue"

Five of the responding teachers favored continuance without change; 21 teachers wanted it continued but with modifications; 3 teachers wanted it discontinued. Of the 21 teachers desiring program continuance with modifications, only 11 teachers indicated why they checked this item. An analysis of their explanations is presented below:

Frequency	Suggested Modification
2	Do not use it with heterogeneous groups, only with students who are linguistically handicapped to a degree that will insure profit from the program.
2	Reduce the amount of math.
2	Make the curriculum material relevant to life situations in an eastern urban area.
1	Include material from other subject areas.
1	Reduce the amount of curriculum material; coverage is unrealistic.
1	Emphasize the self-image aspect more.
1	Review for vocabulary changes.
1	Make it more interesting.

No general trend regarding specific modifications can be determined because of the low number of responses and because of the low frequency counts for each suggested modification. Inferences concerning suggested modifications for the limited sample returning answers seem to indicate a desire for changes in curriculum content and pupil class organization. Whether such changes would be more beneficial to a particular teacher in a particular class or to the program as a whole cannot be determined from these statistics.

Question "20" requested teachers to indicate whether or not they would like to serve in the program again. A forced choice situation was presented by instructing them to check either of the two options: "yes" or "no." Provision for explanation of choice was made. Responses were made as follows:

Option	Number of Choices
"Yes" - would serve again	14
"No" - would not serve again	8
No Response	8

Although a majority of responding teachers indicated they would serve again, approximately one-fourth chose not to respond, while 8 teachers (again, approximately one-fourth) indicated they would not serve in the program again.

Analyses of the reasons for a "Yes" or "No" check indicated the following: Teachers checking "no" (5 out of 8) could not do so, rather than would not do so, because of personal administrative problems such as transfer, program changes and the like. Only 2 of the 5 indicated a dislike for the program as their reason for checking "No." Teachers checking "Yes" numbered 14 but only 3 of them cared to indicate reasons. These 3 teachers really

checked "Yes" with conditions, that is, they would serve only if certain changes were made. A refined analysis of returns in light of the explanations would present the following:

Option	Number of Choices
An unqualified "Yes" return	11 teachers
A conditional "Yes" return	3 "
No Responses	8 "
A "No" response because of program factor	5 "
A "No" response beacuse of a non-program factor	3 "

The balance of interpretive power is with the 8 "No Response" teachers. We cannot determine whether their silence represents assent or dissent, favorable reaction or unfavorable reaction.

CHAPTER 3

THE EXPERIMENTAL STUDY

This part of the report presents the results of several comparative analyses made concerning student language performance. In contrast with the previous part, wherein evaluations were made in terms of subjective reactions recorded upon questionnaires used in the survey method, this part presents findings made by using objective test measures within an experimental design. To implement this aspect of the study control schools had been selected for each of the three experimental schools within the same socio-economic, geographical area of the city. Control classes within each school were administered the same tests as those administered the experimental children. When analyses were done, students were further made comparable by restricting those eligible for participation in the comparative analyses to children having certain comparable characteristics such as ethnic background.

The major questions posed for this part of the study are:

1) Were experimental children receiving the Language Development Program different from control children receiving the conventional program concerning oral language ability as measured by the Ott-Jameson Test?
2) Were experimental children different from control children in linguistic capacity as measured by the Linguistic Capacity Index?
3) Were experimental children different from control children in reading ability as measured by the Metropolitan Test?

Essentially, the experimental program sought to determine the effects of the program upon the children's speaking and reading ability. Primary emphasis was placed upon speaking ability as this was the major aim of the program; reading was investigated as a peripheral aspect of the study since this was not the major aim of the program.

Procedures The plan of evaluation required the initial administration of The Linguistic Capacity Index, The Puerto Rican Scales, The Language Performance Scale and The New York State Reading Readiness Test at the program's inception by the Bureau of Educational Research. The Ott-Jameson Test was administered initially and finally by representatives of the Southwest Development Laboratories.

These instruments, with the addition of the Metropolitan Reading Test, were to be readministered at the end of First Grade.

Previous experience with longitudinal testing programs in the city made the researchers aware of the pupil turnover and absentee factor which would reduce initial population sizes and perhaps effect changes in initial comparability when this aspect was considered for the remaining population available for final testing. To provide for this reality the analysis of covariance was the primary method used for statistical analysis. The basic approach was to include all children having initial and final scores for the variables under investigation and compare them on terminal measures by use of the analyses of covariance. Actual statistical computation was done under a sub-contract with Univac Sperry Rand Corporation.

The Findings The following tables present the results of the analysis of covariance for the measures indicated and the purposes stated. This section,

The Findings, is subdivided in terms of the analysis reported and aspect measured.

Subdivision 1. A Comparison of Control and Experimental Populations in Terms of the Linguistic Capacity Index Tests Administered at the end of the School Year in June, 1968

To compare experimental and control children on L.C.I. scores, three systems were used: first, equating children on the New York State Reading Readiness Score through analysis of covariance and comparing them on criterion scores; second, equating children on initial Linguistic Capacity Index Scores through analysis of covariance and comparing them on L.C.I. criterion scores; third, equating children on both New York State Reading Readiness Scores and L.C.I. scores through analysis of covariance and comparing them on criterion scores. Table 1 presents the results of these analyses.

Table 1

A Comparison of Control and Experimental Children on Final Linguistic Capacity Index Scores when Equated Through Analysis of Covariance Upon Three Sets of Covariates Secured by Initial Testing

Set	Criterion	Covariates	N	df	Experimental Adj."M"	Control Adj."M"	"F"	"P"
1	Linguistic Capacity Index	New York State Reading Readiness	307	1/304	51.43	53.07	11.1	.01
2	"	Linguistic Capacity Index (Initial)	510	1/507	49.99	50.16	.16	NS
3	"	New York State Reading Read. and Linguistic Capacity Index	237	1/233	51.75	53.53	15.8	.01

The table indicates that in Set 1, wherein students are equated on New York State Reading Readiness Scores and examined on final Linguistic Capacity Index Scores, a significant difference occurs favoring the controls. Set 2 indicates that when students are equated on Linguistic Capacity Index Scores obtained at the program's inception and compared on final scores from the same test, no significant difference is noted between controls and experimentals. Set 3 indicates that when students are equated upon both Reading Readiness Scores and Initial Linguistic Capacity Index Scores a significant difference is found in final Linguistic Capacity Index Scores favoring the controls. The null hypothesis is rejected for Sets 1 and 3, but accepted for Set 2.

Conclusion: When control and experimental children are compared in terms of final Linguistic Capacity Index Scores no favorable differences are found for the experimentals; two favorable differences are found for the controls.

Summary: When groups are initially equated by means of analysis of covariance on the New York State Reading Readiness Score and/or the Linguistic Capacity Index no significant differences are found in favor of the experimental group when compared with controls in terms of Linguistic Capacity Index Scores at the end of the year.

Interpretation: This analysis attempted to discover to what extent the English language abilities and disabilities measured by the Linguistic Capacity Index in such areas as contrastive phonology, contrastive grammar and vocabulary of experimental children. The findings indicated that the changes that did occur were favorable for the controls rather than for the experimentals.

Subdivision 2. A Comparison of the Control and Experimental Populations in Terms of the Metropolitan Reading Readiness Scores Obtained During the Final Testing Program in June, 1968.

Although reading ability is not the primary target of this experimental program, any program aimed at improving the linguistic capacity of school children should be examined to determine possible correlative effects upon pupil reading ability. To examine this aspect, three systems were used: first, equating children on New York State Reading Readiness Scores through analysis of covariance and, then, comparing them on criterion scores received from administering the Metropolitan Achievement Test, Primary Battery, Form C. Criterion scores were the raw score total of the first three parts of this test: word knowledge, word discrimination and reading (including both reading sentences and reading stories). The second system involved equating students on initial Linguistic Capacity Index Scores and comparing them on criterion scores from the Metropolitan Achievement Test. The third system involved equating children on both the New York State Reading Readiness Scores and upon the Initial Linguistic Capacity Index Score and comparing them on final criterion scores from the administration of the Metropolitan Achievement Test. Table 2 presents the results of these analyses.

Table 2

A Comparison of Control and Experimental Children on Metropolitan Reading Achievement Scores when Equated Through Analysis of Covariance Upon Three Sets of Covariates Secured by Initial Testing

Set	Criterion	Covariates	N	df	Experimental Adj."M"	Control Adj."M"	"F"	"p"
1	Metropolitan Reading Ach.Scores	N.Y. State Reading Read.Scores	279	1/276	57.75	63.08	5.73	.05
2	"	Init. Ling. Capacity Index Scores	376	1/373	52.46	57.54	6.57	.05
3	"	Both Covariates Used in Sets 1 and 2	198	1/194	59.88	65.57	5.14	.05

This table indicates that in Set 1, wherein students are equated on New York State Reading Readiness Scores and examined on final Linguistic Capacity Index Scores, a significant difference occurs favoring the controls. Set 2 indicates that when students are equated on Linguistic Capacity Index Scores obtained at the program's inception and compared on final scores from the same set, a significant difference is noted favoring the controls. Set 3 indicates that when students are equated upon both of the previously mentioned covariates, again a significant difference is found favoring the controls. The null hypothesis is rejected for Sets 1, a and 3.

Conclusions: When control and experimental children are compared in terms of Metropolitan Reading Achievement Scores no favorable differences are found for the experimentals; in fact, all differences noted indicated that the controls were reading better.

Interpretation: Examination of these groups for possible correlative effects upon reading do not indicate that there is any possible positive transfer.

Similar analyses were done for school by school comparison for each of the criterion variables and with each of the covariates previously mentioned. Results indicated that in cases where there was a difference that difference favored the controls. It was also found that experimental schools differed from school to school on criterion measurements.

Subdivision 3. A Comparison of the Control and Experimental Populations in terms of the Ott-Jameson Tests Administered at the Beginning and End of the 1968-1969 School Year

To compare children in terms of the main variable under consideration, oral English development, the Ott-Jameson Test was to have been used. Administrative difficulties in the final testing program so depleted the sample

population that no statistical analysis of value can be reported.

Subdivision 4. A Comparison of Control and Experimental Populations in Terms of Puerto Rican Scale A Scores. Scale B Scores and Language Performance Scores given at the Beginning and at the End of the School Year by Teachers

To compare children in terms of their English Language Ability changes, the Puerto Rican Scale A, a teacher judgment of the child's English Language Speaking Ability, the Puerto Rican Scale B, a teacher judgment of a child's English Language Listening Ability, and the Language Performance Scale, another teacher judgment of a child's overall ability in the English language, were administered initially and finally. Chi-square analyses revealed the following: that in the case of all three measures the controls were initially poorer than the experimentals in English Language Ability. Similarly, at the end of the program the controls were, in teacher judgment, still poorer. No positive effect can be attributed to the program since the data revealed that the experimental students selected to participate in this program were, in teacher judgment, significantly better in English at the very outset than the controls.

Conclusion: Pupil placement into this program was such that experimental children were as a group better than controls in English Speaking Ability. This initial handicap for controls was maintained over the course of the experiment.

CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSIONS

The Survey of Teachers revealed the following:

1. A majority of the teachers participating in the project had not been trained prior to program inception. One-third of the teachers, however, did attend preparatory training and over 80% reported systematic follow-up during the year.
2. Because of school-wide difficulties at the beginning of the 1967-1968 school year the program was not in "full-swing" until November in most schools. The special staffing arrangement of two teachers per room that year did not cause any negative effect upon the program in teacher judgment.
3. A majority of the teachers felt that a child transferred from their experimental class to another class during the school year would have adjustment difficulty. A Majority also felt that a child going into a regular non-program second grade class the following year would not have difficulty making the adjustment.
4. The program was implemented in classrooms for 20 to 30 minutes each day by over two-thirds of the teachers. The program model, however, required 60 minutes each day. Nearly half the teachers found they had to vary from the manual in implementing the program. The program model, however, permitted little, if any, variation. The experimental factor was vitiated in its content and time aspects.

5. Having classes of children with varying degrees of English Language proficiency or disability was not favored by most teachers.
6. While a majority of the teachers felt the materials were sufficiently durable in their loose-leaf, stapled sets, a large majority disagreed and felt the material should be enclosed in a bound cover.
7. Concerning effects upon children, teachers found the most beneficial aspects of the program in the areas of learning correct language patterns and using complete sentences. The most negative aspects of the program reported by teachers were the monotony of drill and the lack of flexibility because of the structured nature of the program.
8. Concerning the overall program itself, the most frequently stated program advantages were its structured nature and its tendency to develop confidence to speak among children. The most negative aspect of the program, in teacher opinion, was its lack of relevancy in terms of carry-over to other subjects and in terms of relationship to the life-experience of the child.
9. A majority of those teachers who responded, of the teachers experienced in both the experimental and conventional program, rated the experimental program more favorable concerning aims, materials, learning theory, methodology, suitability for student population, ease of teaching and pupil gain.
10. Responding teachers indicated that five wanted the program continued unchanged, 21 wanted the program continued with some modification, but 3 wanted the program discontinued. Although, in response to a criterion item, approximately three-fourths of the staff said they would like to use it again, one-fourth indicated they would not like to use it again.

The Experimental Study revealed the following:

1. The study of the effects of the program upon children's oral English ability by using the Linguistic Capacity Index as a criterion indicated a significant difference favoring the controls.
2. The study of the effects of the program upon children's oral English ability by using teacher ratings initially and finally revealed that the experimentals were initially superior to the controls, this initial advantage was maintained over the year. Effects of the program could not be discerned because of the initial advantage.
3. The study of changes in children's reading ability revealed a significant difference in favor of the controls. This difference may be due to the heavy emphasis upon the audio-lingual aspect among experimentals which is intrinsic to the program.

CHAPTER 5

INTERPRETATION

No definite statement can be made at this time concerning the merits of The Language Development Program as a device by which oral ability in English is improved among speakers of other languages.

The evaluation indicates two serious deficiencies making impossible any definite generalization concerning the efficacy of the Language Development Program as implemented in New York. These deficiencies were:

1. the vitiation of the experimental factor
2. malfunctioning during final test administration of the Ott-Jamison Test making over half the tapes unscoreable

Serious vitiation of the experimental factor occurred because the teachers did not use the material as long as they should have and because teachers did not use the material in a way they should have. Questionnaire returns from 36 teachers indicated that two-thirds of the teachers were using the program only 20-30 minutes each day, whereas the program model required 60 minutes usage each day. These returns also indicated that nearly half the teachers varied from the structured method outlined for the program. The experimental factor, The Language Development Program, was not implemented as long as required nor in the manner required.

The primary aim of this program is to develop an audio-lingual sense of the English language resulting in improved oral ability. The instrument designated by the Southwest Development Laboratory to measure this ability is the Ott-Jamison Test. Although the test administrators from that organization had little difficulty in securing initial test scores, some undetermined mishap occurred during final administration. This resulted in less

than half the students' tapes being scoreable. This loss, plus the loss of pupils which ordinarily occurs during the school year and the loss of subjects which occurs with covariate analyses left research without an adequate number of subjects for analysis.

The report's primary value consists of the data it contains concerning the problem of implementation, the contrast between positive implications from teacher judgments and negative implications from experimental data, and the apparent differences between the urban population in New York City among whom the experiment was conducted and the norming population in the Southwest.

Failure to implement the experimental program according to model specifications has been traced through interviews to dislocations upsetting the teacher training period during the summer of 1967, to a school strike in September 1967, and to some misunderstanding concerning program operation which is mainly attributable to the difficulties attendant upon instituting a novel program on a widespread basis under such inauspicious circumstances. Most variations from the program model occurred early in the school year; as the school year progressed and as teachers became more familiar with the program requirements, variations tended to decline. One important exception, however, occurred where teachers did not have material to implement subdivisions of the program.

The program's structured nature is both its virtue and vice. The repetitive nature of material within a rigid sequence provides oral benefits to the children and a ready-made lesson plan for the teacher. This structure, however, tends to delimit the areas of instruction available for teacher creativity or variation. Newer teachers tend to find the structured approach a virtue because of the help it provides them in conducting a lesson, but more experienced teachers seem to chafe against the strictures of presentation

demanded by the program. Improved teacher orientation seems advisable if this program is to be instituted among non-volunteers. Teacher attitude and years of experience seem to be conditioning factors affecting implementation. Of course, it remains to be seen whether such a program developed on a different population in a different section of the country among volunteer teachers can ever be implemented without major modification on a non-volunteer basis in a large metropolitan area. Learning theory and curriculum are more easily transferrable than teaching staff and administrative arrangement.

Teacher judgments concerning the program and teacher reports to other aspects queried in the survey indicate a generally favorable opinion of the program, but not without conditions. Noteworthy, however, was the indication by teachers that the students tended to use complete sentences and seemed to be learning correct language patterns. These positive features do not appear strong enough at this time to effect positive differences in experimental studies. This is most likely due to the fact that the instrument most sensitive to picking up these positive features was not completely operational at final testing time. The Ott-Jamison Test was designed primarily to examine the aspects teachers indicated as the most favorable aspects of the program. A major testing should be conducted at the end of the 1968-1969 school term with the Ott-Jamison Test to determine whether teacher indications are verified by test results.

The Linguistic Capacity Index Scores did not show any major effect in terms of the aspects measured. Again, however, a statistical explanation might explain why. The Linguistic Capacity Index was designed to have a possible scoring range of from "0" to "60." The experimental and control children were averaging marks of "40" upon <u>initial</u> testing. This contrasts with the population in the Southwest which generally averaged "30." Whereas

the population in the Southwest had 30 points of growth possible after initial testing, the New York population had only 20 points of growth possible. They were already closer to the ceiling at initial testing than the population in the Southwest. This growth restriction could possibly account for failure of the experimental group to grow more. It seems more likely, however, that since the same handicap existed for both controls and experimentals this was not the true cause. These data are valuable in indicating to us the different nature of the populations being used in the New York study and in the Southwest. This is a fact that must be taken into consideration, especially since many teachers reported that they felt the program should not be used with all Spanish-background pupils in the city. Obviously, some Spanish-background pupils have little difficulty with English; perhaps program benefits should be focused more upon the child most in need. Pupil variations should be analysed in the next report.

Another important aspect to be considered in interpreting the results is the longitudinal nature of the program. Initially designed to be implemented for three years, the audio-lingual nature of the approach in first year may be accompanied by some loss in reading ability. This loss, however, is expected to be overcome in second year with, hopefully, positive reading results attributable in third year to transfer from the audio-lingual aspect of the program. Reading is an aspect that should definitely be investigated during the next two years.

No positive program value was indicated in any of the experimental studies; some positive value was indicated in the teacher questionnaires. Whether the program's failure to meet expectations in every regard was primarily due to the problems of implementation, to the problems of evaluation or to the program itself should be clearer to all at the end of the 1968-1969 evaluation. The evidence from teacher questionnaire bids us to be hopeful; the evidence from experimental data bids us not to become overly optimistic.

APPENDIX A

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TESOL

Name _____ School _____

Class Number _____

Program Designation:
Texas Linguistic Program_____
Miami Linguistic Program_____
Merrill Linguistic Program_____

Please complete the following information as indicated:

	YES	NO
1. Have you taken any college courses for preparation to teach in this program?	___	___
Please explain :		
2. Have you taken any special in-service training for preparation to teach in this program?	___	___
Please explain:		
3. Has there been any systematic follow-up in terms of in-service training, demonstration lessons, lectures, etc. so that they may function more effectively in this program?	___	___
Please explain:		
4. Have you been given adequate help in conducting the program in your classroom by:		
project director	___	___
district coordinator	___	___
Other (specify)	___	___
Please explain:		

5. When did the program get into full swing in your classroom?

Sept. ___ Oct. ___ Nov. ___ Dec. ___ Jan. ___ Other ___

Please explain:

	Yes	No
6. Does the special arrangement of two teachers per room in some classes hamper the success of the program?	___	___

Please explain:

7. (A) Is the articulation between this program and other kindergarten and first grade programs such that a child in your class would easily fit into another class using a different type of curriculum material this year?

(B) Would a child in your class have difficulty, becuase of the nature of this program, in adjusting to another class using the conventional program next year?

Please explain:

8. How many minutes a day do you spend in the use of the curriculum materials? (Please specify)

9. Are you using the curriculum material as it is described in the teacher's manual or are you using some variation? (Please specify)

10. Is the curriculum material that you are using in your class suitable for use with academically homogeneous or heterogeneous class?

Homogeneous _____ Heterogeneous _____

Please explain:

11. Are the curriculum materials that you are using sufficiently durable?

Yes _____ No _____

12. Are the curriculum materials easily adaptable to the individual needs of the children in your class?

Yes _____ No _____

Please explain:

13. Please explain in what ways, if any, the children have profited from participation in this program.

14. Please explain in what ways, if any, the children have failed to profit from participation in this program.

15. What are the principal advantages of this program?

16. What are the main disadvantages of this program ?

17. Rate the quality of cooperation you received from each of the following:

Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Very Poor
5	4	3	2	1

____ Principal

____ Asst. Principal

____ ESL Teacher

____ Dist. Coordinator

____ Parents

____ Other participating teachers (if any)

____ Non-participating teachers

____ Project director or representative

____ Other (specify)

Please explain if necessary:

18. In comparison to the program for teaching English to speakers of other languages as outlined in the Handbook for Language Arts, Pre-K Grades One and Two, how would you evaluate the program that you are now teaching? Please make a response for each of the categories listed below:

	Traditional Program	Experimental Program
Aims		
Materials		
Learning Theory		
Methodology		
Suitability for your student population		
Ease of Teaching		
Pupil Gain		
Pupil Reaction		
Other		

19. I suggest the program in my school should be:

continued unchanged ____

continued with modification ____

discontinued ____

Please explain:

20. I would like to participate in this program next year.

Yes ____ No ____

Please explain:

21. (To be answered only by teachers in the Texas Linguistic Program)

Which is the reading program that you are using in the experimental class?

22. (To be answered only by teachers using the Merrill and/or Miami Lingustic Program)

What is the reading program that is being used by the control class in your school?

ITEM NO. 13

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
Language Development Project
110 Livingston Street - Brooklyn, New York

Helene M. Lloyd, Assistant Superintendent — Eugene C. Gibney, Director

EVALUATION DESIGN, 1968-69

A. INITIAL TESTING PROGRAM - First Grade Classes

1. For all first grade classes (including schools entering the project for the first year) the following measures were administered to secure initial equating or status information:

   a. The Linguistic Capacity Index
   b. The Puerto Rican Scale "A"
   c. The New York State Reading Readiness Tests

2. Time of Testing

   a. The Linguistic Capacity Index was administered in the first week of January, 1969.
   b. The Puerto Rican Scale "A" is administered as part of the city-wide testing program of children with handicaps in English because of another mother tongue. It is administered during the child's first month in school in the fall of 1968. This date will vary somewhat from school to school and class to class depending upon the strike situation prevalent at the time.
   c. The New York State Reading Readiness Test was administered as part of the city-wide testing program during the month of December, 1968. This test was delayed until then because of the strike. The administration of the Linguistic Capacity Index which had been delivered to all schools in December had to be postponed until the first week of January, 1969.

3. Modification - initial testing involving the revised Ott Test could not be executed because of the inoperable apparatus arranged for in New York by the SEDL and the Norelco Company. A planned pilot testing scheduled for December and at which members of Norelco and SEDL were present for demonstration purposes to BER staff failed to be executed. SEDL found that the Norelco equipment they had intended using with their master tape could not be properly synchronized to permit testing six or eight - students at a time as promised. After improvising with equipment provided by our own Bureau of Audio Visual Instruction, representatives of Norelco and SEDL could only provide one operable unit for testing; unfortunately only one student could be tested at a time. It became obvious that the inability to test more than one child at a time made the initial testing program, planned around a multi-testing schedule, impossible. SEDL and Norelco agreed to work the technical problem out and report in 1969. Consequently, the Ott Testing program could not be implemented on an initial basis.

B. INITIAL TESTING PROGRAM - Second Grade Classes

1. For all second grade classes, experiencing their second year in the program, the measurements administered last year (1967-68) as part of that year's initial testing program, while these students were in first grade, will be used again to secure initial equating or status information. These measures include:

   a. The Linguistic Capacity Index - administered in 10/1967.
   b. The Puerto Rican Scale "A" scores - secured in 10/1967
   c. The New York State Reading Readiness Scores - obtained in 11/1967.

2. For some of these same present second graders, Ott-Jameson Test Scores are available. Approximately 70 control and 70 experimental students were tested in 10/1967, as selected samples for that school year, by representatives of the SEDL. These scores can be used for equating this selected population and comparing them on June, 1969 Ott Test scores.

3. Scoring

   The Linguistic Capacity Index tests administered as part of the Initial Testing Program have all been scored and checked by the clerical staff of the BER. Scores are now being tabulated upon master data sheets. The initial Puerto Rican Scale "A" scores were entered on student record cards in October or November, 1968. These scores will be obtained from the schools in April, 1969. The Pupil Background Form, used last year for this purpose, will again be sent to the schools to secure demographic information, but the score secured will be used as an initial measurement. New York State Reading Readiness Scores are available now at the Bureau of Educational Research. These will be transcribed onto master data sheets as soon as the clerical staff completes tabulation of Linguistic Capacity Index scores. It is anticipated that this work will begin in late March, 1969. Once the Linguistic Capacity Index Scores and the New York State Reading Readiness scores have been tabulated, the Puerto Rican Scale Scores will be transcribed onto master data sheets beginning in late April. It is anticipated that by the end of the first week in May, 1969, all initial testing data for this year will be available on master data sheets.

C. THE FINAL TESTING PROGRAM

1. For all first grade classes (including schools entering the project for the first year) the following measures will be administered:

   a. The Linguistic Capacity Index (May, 1969)
   b. The Metropolitan Reading Test, Form B (May, 1969)
   c. The Puerto Rican Scale "A" (final) (June, 1969)
   d. The Language Performance Scale (June, 1969)
   e. The Pupil Background Form (April, 1969)
   f. The Ott Test (300 selected samples) (May, 1969)
      pilot testing of new apparatus - (April, 1969)
   g. Staff questionnaires (June, 1969)

2. For all second grade classes experiencing their second year with the program the following instruments will be administered:

   a. The Metropolitan Reading Test, Form "B" (June, 1969)
   b. The Puerto Rican Scale "A" (June, 1969)
   c. The Language Performance Scale (June, 1969)
   d. The Pupil Background Form (April, 1969)
   e. The Ott Test (400 selected samples) (May, 1969)
   f. Staff questionnaires (June, 1969)

3. Scoring

   a. Scoring of the Linguistic Capacity Index will begin in June, 1969. Pending the availability of sufficient clerical staff, all tests should be scored, checked and tabulated on master data sheets by August 1, 1969. (It is to be noted that termination of many final testing programs in June make huge demands upon clerical staff time).

   b. Final Puerto Rican Scale Scores and Language Performance Scores should be transcribed onto master data sheets by August 1, 1969. (This date, again, is optimistic. Scoring and tabulation conflict with vacation schedules and decrease available staff.)

   c. Metropolitan Reading Tests for first grade must be hand-scored at the Bureau during June and entered on master data sheets by August 1, 1969. Test scores for second graders will be machine-scored commercially and should be available for tabulation on master data sheets by July, 1969. Tabulation will continue until August 1, 1969.

   d. The Ott Test tapes will be forwarded to SEDL in Texas on or before June 1, 1969, for scoring by SEDL. It is anticipated that scores shall be sent to New York for tabulation in BER by August 1, 1969. Tabulation shall require approximately two working weeks.

4. Data Processing

   a. A contract for data processing shall be sought. Preparatory steps for bidding shall be taken in April. The company awarded the contract shall be notified that data processing shall begin August 15th depending upon returns of Ott Test Scores and ability of BER to supply adequate staff for scoring and tabulation during the months of June, July and August.

   b. Initial data processing runs for tryout shall follow key-punching during the third week of August. Returns from tryout runs should be available for scanning by September 1, 1969. Corrections should require one week in September. Final data analyses runs should be made by September 15, 1969.

   c. The subsequent two weeks in September must be devoted to interpretation of the data and the formation of preliminary tables. (Note: this coincides with the period required for preparing a testing plan and materials for the beginning of the third year of the study).

5. The Report - writing the final report for the second year should begin October 1, 1969 and be available in initial draft form by the third week in October. (This writing period coincides with the administration of the initial testing for the third year). Review of the initial draft should be conducted by SEDL, New York State and BER during late October or early November. A final revised report should be ready for publication by the end of November or at the latest, by December 1, 1969.

6. Analyzing, tabulating and interpreting questionnaire returns should be done during the summer of 1969 for write-up in September, 1969.

7. All final testing plans and evaluation plans are based upon the assumption that there will be no unforeseen interruptions of the testing and scoring schedules and that sufficient personnel can be provided to accomplish the described tasks.